

**Remarks:**

1. Claims 1-44 remain cancelled.
2. Claims 45-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Independent claims 45 and 53 have been amended to remove the word “optional” from the claims.
3. Claims 45-47, 49, 51-54, 56, and 58-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hosada et al. (JP 8-340666).
  - a. Re amended claim 45, applicants point out that Hosada does not disclose applicant’s “intermediate magnetically non-conducting bridge segment extending radially from the permanent magnet to an outer circumferential surface of the disk”. This limitation distinguishes the instant invention over the cited prior art.
  - b. Re claim 46-52, since these claims depend from claim 45, for at least the reasons cited in point 3(a), applicants contend these claims are in condition for allowance.
  - c. Re amended claim 53, applicants point out that Hosada does not disclose applicant’s “intermediate magnetically non-conducting bridge segment extending radially from the permanent magnet to an outer circumferential surface of the disk”. This limitation distinguishes the instant invention over the cited prior art.

- d. Re claims 54-61, since these claims depend from claim 53, for at least the reasons cited in point 3(c), applicants contend these claims are in condition for allowance.
  - e. Re claims 62-70, these claims have already been allowed by the Examiner.
  - f. Re new claim 71, this is the original claim 60 combined with claim 53 without the limitation of "an intermediate magnetically non-conducting bridge segment extending radially from the permanent magnet to an outer circumferential surface of the disk". This is the way the Examiner originally read the claim when determining claim 60 as having allowable subject matter. For this reason, new claim 71 should be in condition for allowance.
  - g. Re new claim 72, this is the original claim 61 combined with claim 53 without the limitation of "an intermediate magnetically non-conducting bridge segment extending radially from the permanent magnet to an outer circumferential surface of the disk". This is the way the Examiner originally read the claim when determining claim 61 as having allowable subject matter. For this reason, new claim 72 should be in condition for allowance.
4. Claims 48 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosada in view of Achikita et al. (US 5,091,022).
- a. Because claim 48 depends from claim 45, for at least the reasons cited in point 3(a), claim 48 should be in condition for allowance.
  - b. Because claim 55 depends from claim 53, for at least the reasons cited in point 3(c), claim 55 should be in condition for allowance.


5. Claims 50 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hosada.
- a. Because claims 50 depends from claim 45, for at least the reasons cited in point 3(a), claim 50 should be in condition for allowance.
  - b. Because claim 57 depends from claim 53, for at least the reasons cited in point 3(c), claim 57 should be in condition for allowance.

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough examination of the instant application. Applicants believe that the application is now in condition for allowance and look forward to a timely Notice of Allowance.

Although no fees are believed due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0831 for any fees or credit the account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Jimmy L. Funke

Attorney

Telephone (248) 813-1214

Reg. No. 34166

Date: November 9, 2004